United Nations A/65/831–S/2011/275

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
2 May 2011

Original: English

General Assembly
Sixty-fifth session
Agenda item 34
Protracted conflicts in the GUAM area and their implications for international peace, security and development

Security Council
Sixty-sixth year

Identical letters dated 28 April 2011 from the Permanent Representative of Georgia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to transmit the statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Georgia concerning the Russian Foreign Minister's visit to Abkhazia and the Tskhinvali region (see annex).

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter and its annex would be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 34, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Alexander Lomaia
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

11-31961 (E) 030511

Please recycle

Annex to the identical letters dated 28 April 2011 from the Permanent Representative of Georgia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council

Statement issued on 28 April 2011 by the Georgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the Russian Foreign Minister's visit to Abkhazia and the Tskhinvali region

On 25 and 26 April 2011, the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Sergey Lavrov, went on a "regional tour" of Georgia's occupied territories — Abkhazia and the Tskhinvali region.

The Russian Foreign Minister held meetings with the leaders of the occupying regimes and signed agreements with the latter — agreements which, according to international law, are as null and void as any other agreement or document concluded between an occupying country and the occupying regimes it has set up.

It is both ironic and regrettable that a high-ranking Russian diplomat has had to stage such a comical spectacle as a visit to Georgia's occupied territories and meetings with the proxy leaders of the regimes which occupy them. The grotesque nature of this pathetic performance was further heightened by Mr. Lavrov being decorated by Mr. Kokoity, a notorious criminal.

Such official "visits" to a sovereign country's occupied territories — reminiscent of the style of Soviet political leaders — could be viewed as a cynical provocation, as, in carrying out such visits, Russia seems to be demonstrating that it never intended to comply with the commitments it undertook under the ceasefire agreement of 12 August 2008, in demonstrative defiance of universally recognized norms and principles of international law. At the same time, the Kremlin is trying to create at least an illusion of legitimacy on behalf of the occupying regimes — particularly considering the fact that, despite Russia's consistent efforts and financial generosity, its policy of recognition of the breakaway regions as subjects of international law has met with complete failure.

Equally cynical is the claim that Russia allegedly intends to protect the occupying regimes it set up on Georgia's occupied territories from "further aggression" by Georgia. Mr. Lavrov clearly needs to be reminded that the international community praised Georgia's undertaking to commit to the non-use of force, and that it demands the same from Russia despite the latter country's insistent refusal to do so. Through its militarization of the territories it occupies — including the deployment of multiple-launch rocket systems — it is Russia which poses a threat to peace and stability in the South Caucasus and Black Sea regions.

It is high time for the Kremlin to realize that the present-day world will no more tolerate the redrawing of an internationally recognized sovereign country's borders by force than it would policies of ethnic cleansing, occupation and annexation. The establishment of equal relations based upon the norms and principles of international law — which call for a full withdrawal from Georgia's occupied territories — would suit the interests of both countries.

United Nations A/65/832

General Assembly

Distr.: General
3 May 2011

Original: English

Sixty-fifth session
Agenda item 18 (b)
Macroeconomic policy questions: international financial system and development

Letter dated 2 May 2011 from the Permanent Representative of Singapore to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit to you, on behalf of the informal Global Governance Group (3G), comprising the following States Members of the United Nations: the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, the Kingdom of Bahrain, Barbados, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Jamaica, Kuwait, the Principality of Liechtenstein, Malaysia, the Principality of Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Panama, Peru, the Republic of the Philippines, the State of Qatar, the Republic of Rwanda, the Republic of San Marino, the Republic of Senegal, the Republic of Singapore, the Republic of Slovenia, Switzerland, the United Arab Emirates, Uruguay and the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, the 3G's inputs to the G-20 on food security and the volatility of commodity prices (annex I) and economic development and innovative sustainability: fostering the growth of liveable cities (annex II).

On behalf of the 3G, I should be grateful if you would circulate the present letter and its annex as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 18 (b).

(*Signed*) Vanu Gopala Menon
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

11-32111 (E) 100511

Please recycle

Annex I to the letter dated 2 May 2011 from the Permanent Representative of Singapore to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Global Governance Group inputs to the G-20 on food security and the volatility of commodity prices

1. The Global Governance Group (3G)[a] notes the ambitious French agenda for the G-20's Presidency and refers to the issue of food security and volatility of food prices which is on the G-20's agenda.

2. The 3G is concerned about the world food situation, especially given the other multiple ongoing crises which disproportionately affect developing countries. We also recognize the urgent need to enhance food security policy coordination and coherence and international cooperation, which is important for strengthening the technical and financial capacities of developing countries so that they can increase agricultural productivity, markets and consumption in a sustainable way, to meet current and future food demands, as well as to make food accessible for all.

3. With our current world population estimated at 6.91 billion and with projections for the year 2050 at 7.5 to 10.5 billion, the demand for food is ever increasing. Our collective challenge is to develop global strategies and proposals that can better manage and mitigate the risks of excessive food price volatility without distorting market behaviour. At the same time, these proposals should complement the important discussions and work done in other multilateral forums, like FAO and WTO. Our efforts should therefore focus on strengthening global governance for food security, while reinforcing the work of the various multilateral forums and international organizations. In this regard, we welcome the reform of the FAO Committee on World Food Security, including the setting up of a High-level Group of Experts, and we encourage its work.

4. The 3G notes that excessive volatility of prices works in two directions and creates uncertainty in both exporting and importing countries. This uncertainty affects demand for food, production of food, investment decisions, and overall access to food. The global challenge of food security and volatility of food prices should therefore be addressed holistically, taking into account the challenges of both excessive increases and decreases in food prices. Likewise, attention should be paid to the issue of food safety. Taking such a comprehensive approach could provide producers with sufficient confidence to invest in production, while improving access to food substantially. It could also help importers when planning their budgets related to food. Increased efforts to transfer technology on mutually agreed terms to support developing countries' efforts and enhance productivity are thus important in this regard. Effective risk-management instruments for farmers and up- and downstream industries could also help them in hedging risks from price volatility, while providing for a more stable food supply.

---

[a] The 3G comprises the following States Members of the United Nations: Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Jamaica, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Malaysia, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, San Marino, Senegal, Singapore, Slovenia, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay and Viet Nam.

5. At the same time, the 3G recognizes the need to address the different factors affecting food security and excessive volatility of food prices. One such important factor is trade, particularly the problems related to trade distorting measures such as subsidies not consistent with WTO rules. Such protectionist measures affect production and threaten livelihoods in food-importing and -exporting developed and developing nations. There is also a need to address issues related to agriculture investment, access to land, credit, infrastructure and technical assistance, among others. Furthermore, global challenges such as climate change, the depletion of natural resources and increases in the world population are posing serious risks to food production and we cannot avoid tackling these issues in our discussions and taking them into account in our subsequent actions.

6. The 3G believes that a universal, rules-based, open, non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading system under WTO is key to achieving food security. Such a system would give all actors the necessary guarantees to invest in and promote an efficient development of the agriculture sector. In this context, the successful conclusion of the WTO Doha Development Agenda is essential and long overdue. The 3G therefore calls on the G-20 to renew political commitment and to take urgent action to move the process forward. The engagement of all stakeholders to achieve this goal as soon as possible is also crucial. The speedy conclusion of the Doha Development Agenda will reinforce the role played by trade as the engine for growth and development. The provision of opportunities to develop and enhance productivity in the agriculture sector will also help achieve long-term solutions to food security.

Annex II to the letter dated 2 May 2011 from the Permanent Representative of Singapore to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Global Governance Group inputs to the G-20 on economic development and innovative sustainability: fostering the growth of liveable cities

1. The Global Governance Group (3G)[a] welcomes the Seoul Development Consensus for Shared Growth, which sets out the G-20's commitment to work in partnership with other developing countries to promote stronger growth, reduce poverty and narrow the development gap. The Seoul Development Consensus will help strengthen the G-20's aim towards "strong, sustainable and balanced growth". The 3G also welcomes the intention of France to use its Presidency of the G-20 to focus on the implementation of the decisions taken at previous G-20 Summits, including the issue of development.

2. The 3G reiterates its views on the efforts of the G-20 to foster development, which were encapsulated in a document of the United Nations (A/65/395) dated 28 September 2010. The 3G holds that such efforts by the G-20 should pioneer innovative synergies to augment the effectiveness of national, regional and global pro-growth policies. There is also growing recognition that resources and policies for growth need to address the challenges of rapid urbanization. From the present 50-50 urban:rural population ratio, UN-Habitat has projected that "by 2050 urban dwellers will likely account for 86 per cent of the population in the more developed world and 67 per cent in the less developed regions. Overall, it is expected that 7 out of 10 people will be living in urban areas by 2050".[b] The most rapid urbanization will happen in Asia and Africa; UN-Habitat projects that Africa's population will double from 1 billion in 2009 to 2 billion by 2050, with cities housing a jump from 40 per cent to 62 per cent of citizens.[c]

3. The 3G recognizes that the challenges of urbanization are myriad; not only will they take a toll on resources and infrastructure at the global level, they will also be an immense challenge to the sustainable development and climate change agendas. Lack of good sanitation, proper housing, accessible transport and clean air already plague many cities in developing countries. There has also been over-exploitation of existing resources. Rivers have been polluted, entire ecosystems damaged and forests depleted. With the growing concern among many countries over climate change, managing these issues has and will become of compelling importance for many countries. We therefore all have a stake in the development of liveable cities.

---

[a] The 3G comprises the following States Members of the United Nations: Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Jamaica, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Malaysia, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, San Marino, Senegal, Singapore, Slovenia, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay and Viet Nam.

[b] *State of the World's Cities 2010/2011: Bridging the Urban Divide* (UN-Habitat, 2010).

[c] *The State of African Cities 2010: Governance, Inequalities and Urban Land Markets* (UN-Habitat, 2010).

4. At the same time, the 3G notes that urbanization, when managed well, can be a key driver for development in many countries. The development of urban centres can also have a positive effect on rural development given their symbiotic relationship. The growth of urban centres will encourage further flow of resources to rural areas. The challenge is in ensuring that, as rural development continues, growth in our cities is also sustainable in the long run.

5. The 28 member countries of the 3G are in diverse parts of the globe — Asia and the Pacific, Africa, the Middle East, the Caribbean, Latin America, Europe, and have all experienced the necessity of managing urbanization in bringing about and preserving the gains of development. As such, the 3G would like to offer our perspectives on some areas where countries could direct policies to better foster the growth of liveable cities, which include the following:

- **Long-term and integrated planning.** Planning ahead of time and in an integrated fashion across diverse and competing needs (i.e., economic versus social, housing versus industrial) to manage problems of infrastructure bottlenecks, pollution, climate change, as well as the provision of basic amenities and services, among other challenges of urbanization. In this regard, the 3G notes the importance of consulting and working with urban dwellers, especially the poor and other disadvantaged groups, to better enable them to achieve improved shelter and economic (e.g., livelihoods, jobs) and social (e.g., education, health) outcomes.

- **Effective coordination and implementation.** Working across relevant governmental agencies, at national and local levels, as appropriate, to plan and implement cohesive urban planning strategies, and institutionalizing these cooperative procedures so that they become standard operating procedures. The 3G also notes the importance of developing and encouraging adherence to appropriate regulatory standards. This would encompass building codes as well as ensuring adequate attention to appropriate environmental standards.

- **Making markets work.** Exploring new options for a more efficient allocation of scarce resources connected with urban development (i.e., water, air quality, land use) wherever possible.

- **Social compact.** Developing a sense of well-being and harmony, such as maintaining a multi-ethnic social compact in urbanized living to foster a sense of comfort and familiarity among people of different races. This is integral to what makes a city liveable.

- **Constant innovation.** Developing new ways to enhance a city's liveability through harnessing of technology (i.e., to produce clean energy, water) through research and development, adapting solutions and expertise that others have pioneered, and mutual sharing of urban development experiences.

- **Disaster risk reduction.** With the backdrop of recent disasters that have occurred in many countries around the world, it becomes necessary to increase the resilience of cities and urban areas, in particular by raising the awareness of citizens and local governments about risk reduction options and policies, and by mobilizing political commitment and support to include risk reduction aspects in urban development planning and critical infrastructure investments, such as schools and hospitals.

6. Fostering the growth of liveable cities is an important issue and many countries have a strong stake in ensuring solid outcomes in this area of development. In this regard, the 3G hopes that fostering the growth of liveable cities will be considered within the international development agenda, including at the next G-20 Summit in Cannes, France, as this will translate into tangible and pragmatic development for the citizens of many developing countries. In particular, we call on the G-20 to engage developed and developing countries, the United Nations, multilateral banks and other international organizations in their deliberations. The 3G looks forward to working with France as the Chair of the G-20 Cannes Summit, other G-20 countries and multilateral organizations in 2011.

United Nations A/65/833–S/2011/285

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
5 May 2011

Original: English

General Assembly
Sixty-fifth session
Agenda items 34, 39, 66 and 75

Security Council
Sixty-sixth year

Protracted conflicts in the GUAM area and their implications for international peace, security and development

The situation in the occupied territories of Azerbaijan

Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

Responsibility of States for internationally wrongful acts

Letter dated 29 April 2011 from the Permanent Representative of Armenia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Over the course of the current session of the General Assembly, the representative of Azerbaijan to the United Nations has circulated a number of propaganda papers full of misinformation and falsifications, including the baseless allegation of a killing by an Armenian sniper of a 9-year-old Azerbaijani child as a result of the ceasefire violations.

That allegation is based on groundless information received from the Office of the Prosecutor General of Azerbaijan, as noted in document A/65/821-S/2011/251. What has become a standard product of Azerbaijani propaganda, the latest letter once again tries to discredit Armenia and Nagorno Karabakh. The death of the child was confirmed neither by the OSCE Co-Chairs nor by the personal representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office.

It is unethical to circulate such a defamatory document at the United Nations, which serves no other purpose than to shatter the hope of a peaceful coexistence between peoples. Rather than drafting such a shameful document exploiting the life of a child as a propaganda tool, Azerbaijan should focus on cooperating with the Co-Chairs of the OSCE Minsk Group and its missions and do its part in conducting the investigation, as set out in the statement made by the Armenian, Russian and Azerbaijani Presidents at their meeting in Sochi in March 2011. In that context, Azerbaijan should stop obstructing the work of the OSCE Mission. While the Nagorno Karabakh authorities followed their early commitment and allowed the

Please recycle

OSCE monitoring missions to conduct and assess the situation as agreed, Azerbaijan continues to refuse to grant access to the OSCE Mission despite its prior agreement.

Azerbaijan should abandon its adventurous practice of provocations along the Line of Contact, which is a serious threat to peace and stability in the region. Such actions are also violations of the 1994 Ceasefire Agreement between Azerbaijan, Nagorno Karabakh and Armenia and are contrary to the stated commitment to refrain from the use of force or the threat of the use of force.

It is also important that Azerbaijan revisit its decision to reject the call from the United Nations Secretary-General and the Minsk Group Co-Chairs to remove the snipers from the Line of Contact. This unacceptable behaviour of the Azerbaijani leadership has already resulted in the death of six servicemen of the Defence Army of the Nagorno Karabakh Republic since the above-mentioned meeting of Presidents.

I would like to take this opportunity to stress once again that Armenia advocates the need for a peaceful resolution of the Nagorno Karabakh issue through the implementation of confidence-building measures necessary to consolidate and strengthen the ceasefire regime.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 34, 39, 66 and 75, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Garen **Nazarian**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

United Nations A/65/834

General Assembly

Distr.: General
10 May 2011

Original: English

Sixty-fifth session
Agenda item 120
Strengthening of the United Nations system

Letter dated 9 May 2011 from the Permanent Representative of the Bahamas to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit to you, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) — Antigua and Barbuda, the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, the Commonwealth of Dominica, Grenada, the Republic of Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, the Republic of Suriname, and the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago — a document entitled "Interpretive declaration by the Bahamas on behalf of CARICOM, 3 May 2011, in connection with General Assembly resolution 65/276, entitled 'Participation of the European Union in the work of the United Nations'" (see annex).

On behalf of the CARICOM member States, I would be grateful if you would circulate the present letter and its annex as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 120.

(*Signed*) Paulette **Bethel**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

Please recycle

Annex to the letter dated 9 May 2011 from the Permanent Representative of the Bahamas to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Interpretive declaration by the Bahamas on behalf of CARICOM, 3 May 2011, in connection with General Assembly resolution 65/276, entitled "Participation of the European Union in the work of the United Nations"

Mr. President, on behalf of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) member States, I wish to convey our understanding of how the resolution just adopted should be interpreted.

I. Operative paragraphs

A. Intergovernmental nature of the General Assembly

Operative paragraph 1 of the resolution contains a reaffirmation of the intergovernmental nature of the United Nations General Assembly, and the explicit statement that membership is limited to States that are Members of the United Nations. CARICOM interprets this paragraph as a clear recognition of the priority of Member States over the European Union observer in all activities of the United Nations. CARICOM understands the paragraph as a standing limitation on the European Union observer which prohibits encroachment on the rights and prerogatives of Member States and which constrains the European Union to enjoy only those rights that are specifically and explicitly delineated in this resolution.

B. Ability of other regional organizations to obtain similar status

Operative paragraph 3 is understood by CARICOM as allowing other regional organizations to obtain rights and privileges identical to those set forth in the annex to the resolution. The conferral of identical rights is not dependent on a duplication of the European Union's modalities of integration, nor is it premised on the achievement of any perceived "level" of integration. As long as the members of an organization allow the representatives of that organization to speak on their behalf on any matter, that organization may avail itself of an identical set of rights and privileges. However, no other organization can attempt to claim rights and privileges beyond those enumerated in the annex, as CARICOM understands such rights to be the absolute maximum that a non-State can enjoy in the United Nations.

II. Annex

A. Speaking "among" representatives of major groups

CARICOM notes that the Secretariat's description of this privilege is at variance with our understanding. CARICOM understands the right of the European Union to speak "among representatives of major groups" (annex, para. 1 (a)) to mean that, in regular plenary meetings of the General Assembly, the European Union will be allowed to make interventions prior to individual Member States on the speakers' list, while not taking priority over other major groups that are represented by a State Member of the United Nations. The accepted priority of states over observers will dictate that, in a speakers' list including multiple major groups,

the European Union will not be able to speak prior to any major group represented by a full State Member of the United Nations.

B. Participation in the general debate

The resolution invites the European Union to participate in the general debate of the General Assembly subject to three limitations, namely: (i) the order of precedence; (ii) the practice for participating observers; and (iii) the level of representation. The order of precedence speaks to the fact that Member States enjoy priority over observers when addressing the general debate. The practice for participating observers is a reflection of established practice in the general debate, in which a precedent has been set for the speaking slots typically available to observers, and of the fact that such practice, once established, can be disturbed only in exceptional circumstances. The level of representation is a reflection of the established rules of protocol, whereby heads of State, heads of Government, ministers and heads of delegations are arranged according to their respective protocolary "ranks". CARICOM's interpretation of paragraph 1 (b) of the annex is that the Secretariat must take each of these three factors into account when determining at what time, and on what day, the European Union will be invited to address the general debate. With respect to the level of representation, CARICOM interprets the seventh preambular paragraph as containing an exhaustive list, in order of rank, of the two individuals who may represent the European Union in the general debate, namely, the President of the European Council and the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.

C. Presentation of proposals and amendments

Paragraph 1 (d) of the annex limits the European Union to making only oral proposals and amendments. Thus, the European Union cannot make written proposals or amendments under any circumstances. Further, paragraph 1 (d) of the annex proscribes the European Union from putting proposals and amendments to a vote. This limitation is entirely consistent with the fact that the European Union itself lacks the ability to vote and that, as a non-State, it should not be in a position of forcing Member States to conduct votes on any item. CARICOM interprets paragraph 1 (d) of the annex in tandem with rule 78 [120] of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which sets forth the procedure for submitting and voting on proposals and amendments. Thus, in order for an oral proposal of the European Union to be voted upon, it must first be adopted and reduced to writing by a Member State, and circulated to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting.

D. The right of reply

The unfettered right of reply, as contemplated by rule 73 [115] of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, is a right enjoyed only by States Members of the United Nations, as the rule states. The right of reply extended to the European Union is more circumscribed. Where decision 34/401 on the rationalization of the procedures and organization of the General Assembly defines the exercise of the right of reply as allowing two interventions per item, the European Union will be allowed only one intervention. Similarly, CARICOM understands that the presiding officer will strictly construe the opportunities for the European Union to exercise

this circumscribed right, and will extend it only in cases that clearly reflect explicitly stated collective positions of the European Union.

E. Rights not enjoyed by the European Union

CARICOM understands and accepts this resolution as containing the full and exhaustive list of rights conferred by the General Assembly on the European Union. Without an enabling resolution, observer entities, particularly non-State observers with no path to full membership in the United Nations, enjoy no rights beyond the ability to attend and observe meetings at the United Nations. Accordingly, such resolutions must be strictly construed, in the light of the General Assembly's status as an intergovernmental body of States with sovereign equality. Unless a right is clearly and explicitly delineated in this resolution, it cannot be enjoyed by the European Union or inferred by any presiding officer. Accordingly, CARICOM interprets this resolution as excluding the following rights, inter alia, of Member States:

1. The right to raise points of order, in accordance with rule 71 [113];

2. The right to move any procedural motion, including, but not limited to, the rights to:

   (a) Move adjournment of debate (rule 74 [116]);

   (b) Move closure of debate (rule 75 [117]);

   (c) Move suspension or adjournment of the meeting (rule 76 [118]);

   (d) Move that parts of a proposal or amendment be voted on separately (rule 89 [129]).

3. The right to challenge any decision of the presiding officer of a meeting.

Thank you, Mr. President.